

REMARKS

I. Introduction

In response to the Decision on Appeal dated November 15, 2010, claims 1-30 have been cancelled, and claims 31-60 have been added. Claims 31-60 remain in the application. Re-examination and re-consideration of the application, as amended, is requested.

II. Rationale

The Decision on Appeal indicated that the claims failed to appropriately limit the claims to the building industry in a functional manner.

Applicants have added new claims 31-60. As can be seen, the new claims clearly limit the field of the invention and context in which the invention is used to the building industry and relates to building/construction projects. The functional limitations set forth in the new claims all relate to how to organize a project that has specific and unique properties within the building industry. More specifically, the various drawing files specify geometry data for a building project and a view or a plotting sheet that contains such geometry. The files that all relate to the project are organized in folders based on the type of file. Further, companion files (with a single companion file corresponding to each drawing file) ties each drawing file to a particular building/construction project. Lastly, the claims now provide for performing construction as set forth in the drawing files.

Each of these limitations are consistent with the indications/suggestions set forth in the Decision on Appeal. Further, the limitations set forth in the new claims serve to clearly distinguish the previously cited art. In this regard, the various elements of Applicants' claimed invention together provide operational advantages over Bondy, Halpert, Fujieda, and Rappaport. In addition, Applicants' invention solves problems not recognized by Bondy, Halpert, Fujieda, and Rappaport.

Thus, Applicants submit that independent claims 31, 41, and 51 are allowable over Bondy, Halpert, Fujieda, and Rappaport. Further, dependent claims 32-40, 42-50, and 52-60 are submitted to be allowable over Bondy, Halpert, Fujieda, and Rappaport in the same manner, because they are dependent on independent claims 31, 41, and 51, respectively, and thus contain all the limitations of the independent claims. In addition, dependent claims 32-40, 42-50, and 52-60 recite additional novel elements not shown by Bondy, Halpert, Fujieda, and Rappaport.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is now in good order for allowance and such allowance is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner believe minor matters still remain that can be resolved in a telephone interview, the Examiner is urged to call Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

GATES & COOPER LLP
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

Howard Hughes Center
6701 Center Drive West, Suite 1050
Los Angeles, California 90045
(310) 641-8797

Date: January 18, 2011

JSF/

G&C 30566.255-US-U1

By: /Jason S. Feldmar/
Name: Jason S. Feldmar
Reg. No.: 39,187